

Today's Topics:

ARRL
ARRL and tx/rx mods
Illinois LICENSE for hams (2 msgs)
Packet compression, what issue?
Profanity on rec.ham-radio
Re: ARRL and tx/rx mods

Date: 22 Dec 89 18:41:30 GMT

From: cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sunybcslbowen@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Devon Bowen)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <15161@eerie.acsu.Buffalo.EDU>

In the interested of saving bandwidth for more useful discussion, this will be my last post on the subject...

In article <8912221605.AA11364@decwrl.dec.com>, reiser@victim.dec.com writes:
> I disagree. _73_ has always seemed to me like watered-down electronics. I
> stopped reading it years ago. _QST_ is so much more than _73_ ever was or
> will be. Read "Technical Correspondence" sometime and you'll see what I
> mean.

The last 3 months or so, I've seen letter after letter on the e-mailing lists I'm on and in rec.ham-radio that say, "well, you could always use _____, see the review of it in 73", or "there was a whole article on just what you're looking for in 73 last month!" I feel like I'm really getting lost in my own area of interest and that's because my only contact with ham radio has been through QST.

> Rather than quitting the League (which does a lot more than just publish a
> magazine every month), have you considered sitting down to write an article
> yourself?

No. While I feel I'm up to writing articles of the caliber that are currently published, I don't think I can write at the level I feel should be published. That wouldn't help the situation much.

> If you don't like the content, try to do something about it! If
> you don't like contesting, just don't read the announcements/results - it's
> not like they take more than a few pages at most.

I don't read them. That's the problem. I also don't read the League meeting minutes or any articles about what-I-did-on-my-vacation-relating-to-ham-radio. And that eliminates a good 70% of the magazine!! The only thing I

really look forward to are the ads!

> Quit the League if you
> don't believe in the cause (support and representation for Amateur Radio),
> not just 'cause you don't find anything interesting in their 'report'.

If I don't find anything interesting in their report then I don't believe in the cause because they are not supporting Amateur Radio the way I think it should be supported.

I'm not interested in the politics and I'm not interested in "the good 'ol days" (especially since I wasn't even born in the good 'ol days). There's too much to be done; too much to learn, too much to design, too much to experiment with. I firmly believe that if we take care of this business, which **is** our business, the politics will take care of themselves.

My goal is to make the politicians stand back and say "What?!? You want to cut ham spectrum? Are you nuts? This country would go down the tubes without those guys!" And I want them to say it because they **know** it's true, not because we told them it's true. They have to be TERRIFIED to take it away. Not because of any legal action we take but because we're a service they can't live without. If the credentials of ham radio don't speak for themselves, we don't deserve to exist. I don't feel the ARRL supports this position.

In closing... my all-time favorite quote...

A hundred times every day I remind myself that my inner and outer lives are based on the labors of other men, living and dead, and that I must exert myself in order to give in the same measure as I have received and am still receiving.

- Albert Einstein

I wish the whole world felt the same way.

Devon

Date: 22 Dec 89 19:29:13 GMT
From: sun-barr!newstop!texsun!pollux!attctc!sampson@apple.com (Steve Sampson)
Subject: ARRL and tx/rx mods
Message-ID: <10710@attctc.Dallas.TX.US>

In article <7880101@hpfcdc.HP.COM>, perry@hpfcdc.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:
> I've been told that most military
> bands do not need the type acceptance.
>
> Funny how the government treats itself and commercial interests differently.

>
> Perry Scott
> KF0CA

The military/government agencies have special calibration and repair facilities where civilians usually use a radio until it dies. By ensuring that all radios go through a cal check on a periodic schedule, the type acceptance is a taxpayer waste.

Date: 22 Dec 89 21:10:27 GMT
From: idacrd!mac@princeton.edu (Robert McGwier)
Subject: Illinois LICENSE for hams
Message-ID: <545@idacrd.UUCP>

I was appalled to learn for the first time of this bill in the Illinois legislature for licensing of communications equipment by the state of Illinois. This was reported in this news book (!!) that came out a couple of days ago Ham Radio Newsletter Volume 1, Number 1 edited (compiled?) by KB9BVN.

I thought this was expressly prohibited by the communications act of 1934 and that ONLY the FCC was allowed to license communications gear and individuals in the U.S. Am I wrong? The interviewer from RAIN tried to play cute with the questions and missed the whole point in that the FCC regulates communications facilities in the US.

Bob

--

My opinions are my own no matter | Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
who I work for! ;-) | CCR, AMSAT, etc.

Date: 22 Dec 89 22:24:03 GMT
From: tank!toto@handies.ucar.edu (Sandra Jessica Smyth)
Subject: Illinois LICENSE for hams
Message-ID: <6863@tank.uchicago.edu>

In article <545@idacrd.UUCP> mac@idacrd.UUCP (Robert McGwier) writes:
:I was appalled to learn for the first time of this bill in the Illinois
:legislature for licensing of communications equipment by the state
:of Illinois. This was reported in this news book (!!) that came out
:a couple of days ago Ham Radio Newsletter Volume 1, Number 1 edited

:(compiled?) by KB9BVN.

:

:I thought this was expressly prohibited by the communications act of
:1934 and that ONLY the FCC was allowed to license communications gear
:and individuals in the U.S. Am I wrong? The interviewer from RAIN
:tried to play cute with the questions and missed the whole point in
:that the FCC regulates communications facilities in the US.

:

:Bob

You probably missed what I did on first reading that long
and bandwidth wasteful posting (all that white space!):

> Amateur Radio News

Page 15

> Volume 1, Number 1

April 30, 1989

I think the poster of that long compliation did us a disservice
in NOT pointing out that he was posting an seven month old
newsletter. That Illinois bill, I am told, is dead, and has been
for many months.

--

Sandra Jessica Smyth
toto@tank.uchicago.edu

Believer in lost causes

Date: 22 Dec 89 19:41:51 GMT

From: sun-barr!newstop!texsun!pollux!attctc!sampson@apple.com (Steve Sampson)

Subject: Packet compression, what issue?

Message-ID: <10711@attctc.Dallas.TX.US>

In article <1250102@hpnmdla.HP.COM>, alanb@hpnmdla.HP.COM (Alan Bloom) writes:

> ... If you are ARC'ing a file to save transmission
> bandwidth, than that conforms to the spirit of the FCC rules, if you
> are encoding the transmission in order to obscure the meaning, then
> you're out of line.

>

> A1 N1AL

By ARC'ing a text file you have generated code that uses the eighth-bit.
Any code using the eighth-bit is unspecified. Unspecified codes are
restricted to 6m and up. The restriction was probably meant to keep the
ARC file transmissions out of the HF bands, but I'm only guessing. That's
the spirit of the FCC rules. The cypher restriction does not apply to
compression algorithms, but may apply to encrypted ARC files. I for one
don't intend to ask for a clarification. In the military the first lesson
you learn is: "never ask permission". If it requires you to go up the chain

of command it must be a difficult decision, therefore act first, get permission later (ie, decisions not already made in regulations/directives).

Steve, N50WK, MSgt, SOB, ...

Date: 23 Dec 89 01:39:28 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: Profanity on rec.ham-radio
Message-ID: <30500336@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> >I can think of no time when profanity has added any value to a conversation
> >here or anywhere else.
>
> Amen!

Far more than half the postings add no value.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 22 Dec 89 23:06:00 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: Re: ARRL and tx/rx mods
Message-ID: <30500335@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> I for one appreciate modifications for out of Amateur band operations; one of
> the major stumbling blocks for many Hams to get involved in MARS is finding
> such modificaction information for their rigs. This forum provides a good
channel for desseminating such information.

Icom and Yaesu, and most dealers, will give out the mods info upon proof of a MARS license. Apparently they will do so even if the mods do not actually increase MARS capability (such as on UHF radios). I cannot reach the Kenwood service department to find out their policy. I guess it does not matter since if I cannot reach them, I could never get the mods info, and I would not be buying a Kenwood radio anyway due to that mess.

So if you have a MARS license, it should be a lot easier to get the mods info. I also know of 2 dealers that have said they would do the mods for you, in case you don't feel comfortable about performing surgery on micro miniature surface mount circuit boards. Also Trionyx in Indiana does this business.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--

<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1058
